

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,820	04/04/2001	Eric J. Horvitz	MS150904.1	2915
27195	7590 10/18/2005		EXAMINER	
	UROCY, LLP	YIMAM, HARUN M		
	R, NATIONAL CITY C NINTH STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			2611	
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/825,820	HORVITZ ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Harun M. Yimam	2611

		The state of the s	2011
7	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY	FILED 26 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.
applica applica	oly was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or or tition, applicant must timely file one of the following tition in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appartinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (s:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
	e period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin		
no Exa MC	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this an event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire arminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or DNTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f).	g date of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
have been file under 37 CFR set forth in (b)	time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date d is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late by earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
filing th	otice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comple Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externor of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
	roposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered because
(a) ☐ [^]	They raise new issues that would require further control they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.)	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) 🔲 -	They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	,.	ducing or simplifying the issues for
	They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		:
4. 🔲 The an	mendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applic	ant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)) :	·
	proposed or amended claim(s) would be a owable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendment canceling the
how the The sta	rposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) e new or amended claims would be rejected is pro atus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an explanation of
	s) allowed: s) objected to:		
	s) rejected: <u>1-7,9-18 and 32-34</u> .		:
	s) withdrawn from consideration:		
	OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•
becaus was no	idavit or other evidence filed after a final action, buse applicant failed to provide a showing of good an tearlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is necessary and
entered	idavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing d because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o g a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	ffidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the consideration of the considerati	on of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
	equest for reconsideration has been considered bu Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12.	the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	4o(s)
	•	•	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that Maissel does not anticipate or suggest that a collaborative filtering system generates a recommendation specific to the user, the Examiner cites column 19, lines 27-38, 105 in figure 1, and column 12, lines 23-38 to support the claimed limitations, i.e., "a collaborative filtering system that employs the logged temporal history and disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate database systems to generate a recommendation specific to the user based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals". The Alert 100 cited in column 19, lines 27-38 that makes a recommendation to the user is similar to alert 105 in figure 1, which is an alert based on viewer behavior. Therefore, since every alert that makes a recommendation to the user is based on particular viewer behavior (column 19, lines 27-38, 105 in figure 1), the generated recommendation is specific to the user.

In response to applicant's argument that Maissel does not anticipate or suggest employing the logged temporal history and disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems to make a recommendation specific to the user, the Examiner cites column 12, lines 23-43, where the viewer preference profile comprises program characteristics of preferred programs viewed by a viewer at various time (disparate logged temporal history).

In response to applicant's argument that Maissel does not anticipate or suggest the rating information being from a plurality of disparate collaborative filtering systems, the Examiner cites (column 14, lines 38-46), where the collaborative filtering system (130-figure 1) that employs the logged temporal history and disparate logged temporal history from a plurality of disparate database systems to generate a recommendation specific to the user based at least in part on information obtained from a plurality of users (column 19, lines 27-46) related to a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals (column 12, lines 23-34) comprises a popularity filter.

In response to applicant's argument that Maissel does not anticipate or suggest a database system that logs temporal history related to a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected information, the Examiner cites (140 in figure 1, column 12, lines 23-26, and column 18, lines 4-21), where a database system is disclosed that logs selections of information viewed by a user of the information delivery system (column 14, line 67 - column 15, line 4) and logs temporal history related to a plurality of time subintervals that correspond to the viewing of the selected information (column 12, lines 26-28 and 40-45).

In response to applicant's argument that Maissel does not anticipate or suggest generating a recommendation based on one time subinterval out of a plurality of time subintervals, the Examiner cites column 12, lines 23-45, in which Maissel discloses that the viewer preference profile can include information obtained over a period of time on the various program characteristics of programs viewed by a viewer at various times (plurality of time subintervals) and that any length of time can be used (column 12, lines 23-34). Maissel explicitly discloses that the period of time may be as short as a few minutes or as long as a year or more.

In response to applicant's argument that Ferman does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel, the Examiner cites (paragraph 0285, lines 1-8 and paragraph 0307, lines 1-6), where Ferman discloses that a collaborative filtering system assigns a positive vote to logged selections that are viewed for a dwell time that exceeds a predetermined threshold. Ferman further discloses that the collaborative filtering system assigns a negative vote (paragraph 0307, lines 1-6) to logged selections that are viewed briefly and jumped away to another selection.

In response to applicant's argument that Hopple does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maissel, the Examiner cites (paragraph 0285, lines 1-8 and paragraph 0307, lines 1-6), where Hopple discloses a collaborative filtering model that is adapted to be trained according to time intervals that information has been viewed (column 5, lines 2-9 and 33-41)..

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800